

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Non-Final Office action dated January 6, 2006. Claims 1-31 were examined, all of which were rejected.

In the present Office action: claims 1, 12 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,306,967 (hereinafter “Dow”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0046205 (hereinafter “Easton”); claims 2, 13 and 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow and Easton, and in further view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0094709 (hereinafter “Lakkis”); claims 3-6, 8-11, 14-17, 19-21, 24-27 and 29-31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow and Easton, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,414,542 (hereinafter “Lin”); and claims 7, 18 and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dow in view of Easton and Lakkis, and in further view of Lin.

At the outset, Applicants note that it is not apparent that Lakkis is a proper prior art reference. That is, while Lakkis claims priority to an application filed before Applicants’ filing date, Lakkis is in a chain of continuation-in-part applications. As such, Applicants request, if Lakkis is maintained as a prior art reference, citation to the parent application (filed before Applicants’ filing date) for the alleged teachings.

With respect to the rejection of Applicants’ independent claims 1, 12 and 22, Applicants again agree that Dow does not teach or suggest storing a second digital signal in a buffer along a second signal path. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Dow and Easton does not teach or suggest the use of a buffer to minimize coupling capacitance interference between a first signal path and a second signal path, as is set forth in Applicants’ claim 1. Moreover, the Easton buffers are not employed along a signal path. Further, Applicants respectfully submit that Easton is directed to a code division multiple access (CDMA) spread spectrum communication system. As is understood by Applicants, the Easton system employs an integrated search processor, within a modem, that searches for a best path corresponding to, for example, a best antenna signal provided by one of a plurality of antennas. Applicants note that while the Easton system employs a first buffer to store antenna data samples and a second buffer to store pseudonoise (PN) sequence samples (see paragraph [0050]), the information

stored in the buffers is used to provide information that is used by the search processor to select a path (and an associated receive antenna) that exhibits the least multipath interference (multipath). As is well known, multipath occurs when obstacles (trees, mountains, buildings, etc.) reflect an originally transmitted signal causing the originally transmitted signal and one or more reflected signals to arrive at a receiver out-of-phase and be destructively combined. Additionally, Applicants submit that the motivation for the combination is lacking, as Dow is directed to reducing signal degradation, propagation delay and electromagnetic emission problems in transmission of electrical signals along interconnect lines (such as lines which connect transistors in integrated circuits) and not the reduction of multipath interference, which occurs in wireless transmissions due to obstacles positioned between a transmitter and a receiver. For at least the reasons set forth above, independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Dow and Easton. While of different scope, claims 12 and 22 are also allowable for substantially the same reasons set forth above.

With respect to the rejection of claims 2, 13 and 23, Applicants submit that the motivation for the combination is lacking. That is, it is unclear how implementing the Lakkis delay circuit within Dow would minimize the size of a communication network. Further, Applicants note that Lakkis is generally directed to mitigating multipath interference in a wireless communication system (see, for example, Lakkis paragraphs [0075] through [0077]). According to Lakkis, a channel access protocol is defined that uses a common wideband communications channel for all communications cells. The wideband communications channel is divided into a plurality of sub-channels and different sub-channels are assigned to one or more users within a cell. By segmenting a bandwidth into a plurality of sub-channels and generating a distinct data stream for each sub-channel, multipath effects can be reduced. Moreover, while Lakkis does disclose the use of time delay circuits, within a transmitter, the time delays are used to provide two bands, an odd band and an even band (by combining a signal with a delayed version of itself), at an output of the transmitter and are not merely used to delay a signal along a transmission path. As is discussed by Lakkis, the system 4400 of FIG. 44 is used to generate dual bands that can be selected for use by a particular service access point (SAP). As is described, a data stream 4402 is split into two parallel data streams: an even parallel data stream 4406 and an odd parallel data stream 4408. Each data stream is then combined with a delayed version of itself to produce data streams 4414 and 4416. These data streams are then combined to

produce data streams 4420 and 4422. By including delays 4410 and 4412 and ensuring that certain bits are always zero the output of the transmitter can be configured such that two bands (odd band 4426 and even band 4428) appear at the transmitter output when the data streams are frequency shifted and combined. Additionally, Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-11, 13-21 and 23-31 are also allowable for at least the reason that they depend upon an allowable claim.

Claims 1-31 are in the case. All claims are believed to be allowable over the applied art of record, and a Notice of Allowance to that effect is respectfully solicited. Nonetheless, if any issues remain that could be more efficiently handled by telephone, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at the number listed below.

<u>CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION</u>	
I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this correspondence is being	
<input type="checkbox"/> deposited with the US Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail and addressed as shown above.	
<input type="checkbox"/> facsimile transmitted to the US Patent and Trademark Office.	
_____ Michael R. Long	_____ Date

EXPRESS MAIL LABEL: _____

Respectfully submitted,



Michael R. Long, Reg. No. 42,808
Attorney for Applicant(s)
(512) 338-6324 (direct)
(512) 338-6300 (main)
(512) 338-6301 (fax)